

cited by some who oppose his nomination in fact validates Mr. McConnell's testimony to the committee. There has been no inconsistency in Mr. McConnell's testimony, either to the committee or in sworn testimony in a deposition. Jack McConnell is not a party to the lawsuit. He has been accused of no wrongdoing. There is no basis to believe that Mr. McConnell did not answer questions from members of the committee truthfully. Some Senators may feel strongly that Mr. McConnell and his firm were wrong to sue lead paint companies, but there is simply no basis for believing that Mr. McConnell was untruthful with the committee. I hope other Senators will reject those conclusions.

With more than 25 years of experience as an outstanding litigator in private practice, Mr. McConnell has been endorsed by The Providence Journal, which wrote: "In his legal work and community leadership [he] has shown that he has the legal intelligence, character, compassion, and independence to be a distinguished jurist." This debate should focus on Mr. McConnell's qualifications, experience, temperament, integrity, and character. Any fair evaluation of his qualifications would reveal a nominee worthy of confirmation.

I congratulate Jack McConnell and his family on his confirmation today. I commend Senator REED and Senator WHITEHOUSE for their steadfast support and all they have done to ensure that the Senate vote on this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining time postclosure be yielded back and the Senate proceed to vote on the confirmation of the nomination of John J. McConnell, Jr., to be a U.S. District Judge for the District of Rhode Island; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; the Senate then resume legislative session and proceed to a period of morning business for debate only until 7:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John J. McConnell, Jr., of Rhode Island, to be United States District Judge for the District of Rhode Island?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER),

and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) would each vote "yea."

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 44, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 66 Ex.)

YEAS—50

| | | |
|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Baucus | Harkin | Nelson (FL) |
| Begich | Inouye | Pryor |
| Bennet | Johnson (SD) | Reed |
| Bingaman | Kerry | Reid |
| Blumenthal | Klobuchar | Rockefeller |
| Brown (OH) | Kohl | Sanders |
| Cantwell | Landrieu | Schumer |
| Cardin | Lautenberg | Shaheen |
| Carper | Leahy | Stabenow |
| Casey | Levin | Tester |
| Conrad | Lieberman | Udall (CO) |
| Coons | Manchin | Udall (NM) |
| Durbin | McCaskill | Warner |
| Feinstein | Menendez | Webb |
| Franken | Merkley | Whitehouse |
| Gillibrand | Mikulski | Wyden |
| Hagan | Nelson (NE) | |

NAYS—44

| | | |
|------------|--------------|-----------|
| Alexander | Enzi | McConnell |
| Ayotte | Graham | Moran |
| Barrasso | Grassley | Murkowski |
| Blunt | Hatch | Paul |
| Boozman | Hoeven | Portman |
| Brown (MA) | Hutchison | Risch |
| Burr | Inhofe | Rubio |
| Chambliss | Isakson | Sessions |
| Coats | Johanns | Shelby |
| Cochran | Johnson (WI) | Snowe |
| Collins | Kirk | Thune |
| Corker | Kyl | Toomey |
| Cornyn | Lee | Vitter |
| Crapo | Lugar | Wicker |
| DeMint | McCain | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|-------|--------|---------|
| Akaka | Coburn | Roberts |
| Boxer | Murray | |

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate will resume legislative session.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate is now in a period for the transaction of morning business for debate only until 7:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for a much longer period of time, for 45 minutes. I may not use all that time, but I would like to have permission to speak for that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ETHANOL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it is not going to surprise any of my colleagues or the public at large that a lot of times I come to the Senate floor to speak about agriculture and to speak about ethanol. What brings me to the floor today is the ongoing crusade by the Wall Street Journal, in an intellectually dishonest way, to put out a lot of facts about ethanol that are not true.

The latest barrage comes from an interview published last Saturday in the Wall Street Journal with C. Larry Pope, CEO of Smithfield Foods. In this article, there are a lot of misstatements about ethanol and about ethanol causing the price of food to rise dramatically. I take the floor now to rebut some of those misstatements and also to set the record straight so that when a very fine CEO such as Mr. Pope, even though I disagree with him on this article—he is a decent person, and he is a good corporate executive—the next time, he will not speak. But I can also say I do not like to have confrontations with Smithfield Foods because they do provide a lot of good-paying jobs in the Middle West, and they do a good job of adding value to agriculture.

There has been a tradition at Smithfield to kind of not appreciate American agriculture. It goes back to some conversations I had with the previous CEO by the name of Joe Luter. I remember Joe Luter coming to my office to try to explain to me some things he thought I had misinterpreted of what he was really talking about regarding the family farmer and about the production of hogs and whether he was wanting to put the family farmer out of business.

I remember just as if it was said to me yesterday a statement he made when I said: You are running the family farmer, the family producer, the independent producer out of the hog business, and you want to control everything. He said to me something along the lines: I do not want to put your farmers out of business; I just want them feeding my pigs. He was basically saying he wanted the family farmer to be an employee of Smithfield and not be an independent producer.

Another point he tried to argue with me—and I am referring to Mr. Pope's predecessor, Mr. Luter—he also argued that Iowa farmers in a sense were not smart enough to run a packing plant. In fact, he offered to give a plant to a group of farmers and guaranteed it would be out of business within 6 months.

I do not know whether I have fault with Mr. Pope as CEO of Smithfield and ethanol in this case as opposed to Mr. Luter, his predecessor, and who is going to raise pigs, but there may be an institutional bias within the corporation of Smithfield.

Anyway, with that as background, I want to go to this article I pointed out that was in the Wall Street Journal. The article says: "It is Getting Hard to Bring Home the Bacon." Basically, what the paper is saying in that headline is that because so much corn is used for ethanol, we are raising the price of corn and that is driving up the price of food.

Well, I am on the floor to say that is a bunch of hogwash. This article was in the April 30 edition of the Wall Street Journal, so if people want to read it and check it against what I have to say, I am happy to provide that information. The article was based on an interview with C. Larry Pope, CEO of Smithfield Foods, the largest pork producer and the largest pork processor.

The opinion piece was intended to share Mr. Pope's view on rising food prices and also on the price of pork. Mr. Pope puts much of the blame on the Federal ethanol program. But I wish to address a number of the claims made by Mr. Pope, and claims made in the opinion piece presumably based on statements by Mr. Pope.

Mr. Pope claims, and I quote:

Now, 40 percent of the corn crop is directed to ethanol, which equals the amount that is going into livestock food.

Right there, statistically, he is wrong. Let me point out how he is wrong. In 2010, 4.65 billion bushels of corn were used to produce 13 billion gallons of ethanol. But ethanol production uses only the starch from a corn kernel. So I want to hold up a bag of corn kernels. It would be better if I brought in an ear of corn, but this is the best way to transport it. These are corn kernels.

When ethanol uses only the starch from the corn kernel, the result is that more than one-third, or 1.4 billion bushels of corn—and it is called dried distiller's grain, and this is what dried distiller's grain is—was available as a high-value livestock feed. In fact, what is left over after you produce ethanol is of much more value than if you would take the original corn kernels and use that by itself for animal feed.

Let's go back to that quote.

Now, 40 percent of the corn crop is directed to ethanol, which equals the amount that is going into livestock food.

Well, on a net basis now, ethanol production used only 23 percent of the U.S. corn crop—far less than the 40 percent that ethanol detractors claim. So once again, you have a bushel of corn—56 pounds. Out of that 56 pounds of corn, you get 2.8 gallons of ethanol. When you get done making the ethanol, you have 18 pounds of dried distiller's grain that is left over. Anybody who isn't ignorant about ethanol understands there is still an animal feed product left over. So you can't say you are making ethanol out of corn and using it all for ethanol and nothing for food, because this is a very efficient process.

By the way, let me say this. You can tell about the ignorance over ethanol in this town because a lot of people

pronounce it E-E-E-T-H-A-N-O-L. It is ethanol. But people who are ignorant about it don't even know how to pronounce it. I don't know whether Mr. Pope pronounced it right or not.

According to the USDA, feed use consumes 37 percent of the U.S. corn supply, much more than the 23 percent consumed by ethanol production. So I hope Mr. Pope will put that in his pipe and smoke it, because he is wrong on that point. Ethanol is not diverting corn away from feed use.

Next, Mr. Pope claims:

Ethanol policy has impacted the world price of corn.

I am glad Mr. Pope raised that issue. He clearly has no idea how little an impact ethanol has on the global grain market. In fact, U.S. ethanol use represents a mere 3 percent of the world's supply of coarse grain. In addition, the global grain supply in 2010 to 2011 is 11 percent larger than the 2000 to 2001 supply.

U.S. farmers happen to be the most productive in the world. Since 1975, American farmers have doubled U.S. corn production from under 6 billion bushels to over 12 billion bushels last year, and they have done it using essentially the same number of acres. Corn farmers today grow five times as much corn as they did in 1930 on 20 percent less land.

So for all those people out there who think there isn't enough productivity in the American farmer or in our land or in the efficiency of producing, I hope you understand that we are producing five times more corn than we did in 1930 but doing it on 20 percent less land. Let me explain it another way. In 1910, you know what powered agriculture? Horses and mules. And in that day, it took 90 million acres of land to grow the food to keep the animals that powered agriculture alive and productive. That 90 million acres is equal almost to the 92 million acres that will be planted to corn in the United States this year.

Farmers are continuing to meet the growing demand of ethanol, livestock feed, and exports. So I hope that Mr. Pope will put that in his pipe and smoke it, because he needs to understand how productive the American grain farmer is.

The author of the opinion piece then makes a claim that has absolutely no basis in fact, so I guess I can't attribute this to Mr. Pope. The article states:

The EPA has found ethanol production has a neutral to negative impact on the environment.

I have always said that ethanol is good for the environment, but here we have the EPA being quoted stating it has a neutral to negative impact on the environment. The fact is, under the renewable fuels standard created in 2007, corn ethanol was required to reduce greenhouse gas emissions compared to gasoline by at least 20 percent. Corn ethanol has exceeded that threshold. In other words, the law says such and

such, and ethanol exceeds what the law even requires.

A reduction of more than 20 percent compared to gasoline is not neutral. So the EPA has found ethanol production has neutral to negative impact on the environment. Not so. If you remove EPA's use of murky science surrounding emissions from what is called indirect land use—and that is kind of complicated, so I won't go into that—ethanol reduces greenhouse gas emissions by 48 percent compared to gasoline.

I have heard Senators in the last 2 months on the floor of the Senate telling all of us that ethanol was bad for the environment, but a recent peer-reviewed study published in the Yale Journal of Industrial Ecology—all those Ivy League people in the Senate ought to have some allegiance to anything done by Yale University—says that ethanol reduces greenhouse gas emissions by up to 59 percent compared to gasoline.

Mr. Pope also asserts that Pilgrim's Pride went bankrupt because of ethanol. Pilgrim's Pride was a food processor. He stated:

The largest chicken processor in the United States, Pilgrim's Pride, filed for bankruptcy. They couldn't raise prices, so their cost of production went up dramatically.

Again, facts are stubborn things. On December 1, 2008, analysts cited the primary cause of bankruptcy was their large debt load, the result of the acquisition of a \$1.3 billion rival they purchased in 2007. Other factors included low chicken demand and prices resulting from the recession and poor commodity hedging. But it had nothing to do with the price of ethanol and corn prices being high. So I hope Mr. Pope will put that in his pipe and smoke it.

Another statement by Mr. Pope seems to place all the blame on corn farmers for rising food prices. He said:

You eat eggs, you drink milk, you get a loaf of bread, and you get a pound of meat. All of those are based on grains.

That last part of the statement is accurate. But let me tell you what is wrong with the relationship between rising food prices and the price of grain. Let us look at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The farm value of every food dollar is 19 cents. In other words, if you spend \$1 on food at the supermarket, only 19 cents of that goes into the pocket of the farmer. Of that 19 cents, the corn value of that farmer's income is 3 cents.

So let us look at some of these prices. You buy a box of corn flakes—12.9 ounces. Only 5.6 cents goes to a farmer if the corn is \$4 a bushel. If corn is \$6 a bushel, the farmer gets 8.6 cents out of a whole package of corn flakes. Soft drinks: \$4 a bushel, the farmer gets 6.6 cents. If it is \$6 a bushel, he gets 10 cents.

Beef: The farmer gets 18.2 cents at the low end of corn prices, and 27.8 cents at the higher end.

I could go on with pork and chicken and turkey and eggs and milk. But the

point is, don't blame the farmer when you buy a box of corn flakes because the farmer gets a little over a nickel, or at most, if corn is higher priced, 8.6 cents. So the farmer gets 19 cents in a global way. Corn only accounts for 3 cents out of \$1 of food that you buy. The other 81 cents of that \$1 goes to labor, goes to energy, goes to transportation, goes to marketing, and goes to packaging.

The World Bank, in 2008, stated that biofuels were a large contributor to rising food prices. And you know what, 2 years later, in 2010, they released a more thorough analysis that essentially dismissed that idea. So I want to quote from the World Bank report.

... the effect of biofuels on food prices has not been as large as originally thought. ... the use of commodities by financial investors may have been partly responsible for the 2007–2008 spike.

So, for Mr. Pope, I hope he puts that in his pipe and smokes it because he is wrong about the amount of corn and the price of corn and the impact on food prices, and the World Bank dismisses that as well. We even have the United Kingdom—I like to say Great Britain instead of United Kingdom—their Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs concluded in 2010 that “available evidence suggests that biofuels had a relatively small contribution to the 2008 spike in agricultural commodity prices.”

In 2009, the Congressional Budget Office evaluated the increasing demand for corn to produce ethanol on food prices. Maybe I better start with the 5.1-percent increase in food prices for the year 2009. Of that 5.1 percent, just one-half of 1 percent, between that and eight-tenths of 1 percent—I better say it more accurately. We have a 5.1-percent increase in food prices. Only one-half percent, maybe up to .8 percent of that 5.1 percent was due to the demand for ethanol, and about 10 percent of just the increased price of food was because of ethanol.

In 2007, Informa Economics concluded that “it is statistically unsupported to suggest that high and/or rising corn prices are the causative reason behind high and rising retail meat, egg and milk prices.”

Another point raised in this article by Mr. Pope needs to be addressed. He said, “Over the last several years, the cost of corn has gone from a base of \$2.40 a bushel to today at \$7.40 a bushel.” While true, this all needs to be put in context. Over that same period of time, crude oil prices went from \$50 a barrel to nearly \$150 a barrel. Today, it is over \$110 a barrel. Gold prices went from \$500 an ounce to \$1,500 an ounce today.

Mr. Pope would rather pay \$2.40 a bushel for corn rather than \$7.40. I understand that. But does he know what impact that would have on agriculture? If corn were only \$2.40 a bushel, every farmer today would be out of business because the cost of production is around \$4 a bushel.

I can see he wants the farmers to subsidize Smithfield if he wants to continue getting corn for \$2.40 a bushel, but a farmer cannot subsidize the big corporations. Perhaps Mr. Pope would rather have us support government subsidies so long as they would allow him to buy corn below the cost of production.

I can tell you this: A lot of people say ethanol is the reason corn prices are high. It might be part of the reason. But let's suppose you didn't have any ethanol and you had \$2.40 a bushel for corn. You know darn well that a lot more would be coming out of the Treasury to make sure the safety net for the family farmer was working than we give for an ethanol subsidy.

Regardless, at \$7.40 a bushel, the corn costs in a gallon of milk is about 46 cents; the cost of corn in a pound of chicken is about 34 cents; 1 pound of beef takes about 92 cents worth of corn; and relative to Smithfield because they are big in pork, 1 pound of pork requires about 39 cents of corn. So if that \$4.54-a-pound for bacon in the grocery aisle contains only 39 cents worth of corn, perhaps Mr. Pope should explain to all of us—and, most important, to the people who buy it, the consumer—where the other \$4.15 or 91 percent of the retail cost is going.

In addition, after the steep rise in commodities in 2008, prices of corn and other commodities retreated very significantly. I don't recall seeing from people like Smithfield, that when corn was \$7 3 years ago and it went down to \$3.58—I didn't see a very dramatic drop in prices at the grocery store after the corn prices dropped, which leads me, as I have so often said on the floor of the Senate, that these food processors need to scapegoat something to increase the price of their product to the retailer and the consumer. Then when the price goes down, they have increased their price but the price doesn't go down accordingly.

Mr. Pope claims rising corn prices are hurting his business. He said, “Rising prices are already squeezing food producers 2 to 3 percent earnings margins.” That is his quote. The statement is rather surprising given the contradictory earnings report for Smithfield Foods that came out March 10, 2011. Smithfield reported net income for the quarter of \$202 million, an increase of \$165 million over the same quarter in 2010. Mr. Pope stated at the time of the earnings report: “We are extremely pleased with the record performance of our company in the third quarter. Year to date, our earnings have surpassed that of our record year.”

The reality of Smithfield's record profits fails to validate the rhetoric. According to the article—and here I am quoting the article and not Mr. Pope:

Smithfield's economists estimate corn prices would fall by a dollar a bushel if ethanol blending wasn't subsidized.

I guess if it is Smithfield's economists, it must be coming directly from

the company, then. Smithfield may want to invest, then, in better economists.

According to an April 2011 study issued by the Center for Agricultural and Rural Development at Iowa State University, only 14 cents or 8 percent of the increase in corn prices from 2006 to 2009 was due to ethanol subsidies. The study also found that without the ethanol subsidy, corn prices would have averaged only 4 percent less over the same period of time.

Finally, the article calls into question the value of ethanol to our Nation's energy supply. It states:

The ethanol industry would supply only 4 percent of the nation's annual energy needs even if it used 100 percent of the corn crop.

This is a straw man. No one is arguing that ethanol will replace our Nation's entire energy needs. Using just 23 percent of the corn crop, we are displacing nearly 10 percent of our Nation's foreign oil dependence. Domestic ethanol production ranks behind only the United States and Canadian oil production in terms of domestic transportation fuel supply.

It is obvious that Saturday's opinion piece in the Wall Street Journal was just another coordinated effort to undermine and scapegoat homegrown ethanol and America's corn farmers to help deflect criticism from big food producers. Make no mistake, Smithfield's CEO, Larry Pope, is concerned with only one thing—Smithfield's bottom line.

While companies such as Smithfield perpetuate a smear campaign to boost their profits, American farmers and alternative-fuel producers are working hard to produce a reliable and safe supply of food, fiber, and feed for the Nation and the world.

That is the end of my reaction to what he, Mr. Pope, said, but I would like to end by saying that the marketplace will take care of this. You know, 30 years ago when we started an ethanol program, we produced about 100 bushels of corn to the acre on average. Today, nationally, I think it is about 155 bushels of corn to the acre. In Iowa, I think it is about 168; the year before, it was 182.

People who are experts in genetics can say we will be able to double the production of corn over the next 50 years. That is one way we can solve this problem. The other way is that there is a massive amount of land in a lot of places on this Earth, and a great part of it is in West Africa, South Africa, and parts of East Africa, where, if people would establish law guaranteeing property rights, title to land, there would not be governmental disincentives to growing food, there would not be a cheap food policy—there would be a massive production of foodstuff in this world.

In the United States, we are going to continue to produce more. There are going to be 4 million more acres of corn grown this year than last year.

There are even some odd things being done because the price of corn is \$7.

From the Des Moines Register, this headline, from a northern small community of Iowa: At the Whittemore Golf Club, the golf course is going to be plowed up and planted with corn. There are some extreme measures that will be taken here to respond to the demand for food or fiber or fuel.

Just remember, agriculture in America has the capability—the demonstrated capability to produce it all. We don't grow crops just for food. We have always grown for food and fiber, and for the last 30 years, food, fiber, and fuel. We can continue to do it, and we are going to do it successfully, and the consumers of America are not going to pay for it. In fact, if we do not continue to do that and keep the family farmer of the United States healthy and strong—and ethanol is a contribution to that—then we are not going to be able to meet the needs of our society.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT CVAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today we congratulate an important Senate employee on retiring after 34 years of dedicated service. Robert Cvar started working at the Senate Recording Studio on August 1, 1977, as a film technician. He worked his way up the ladder to become a broadcast production director. In addition to television studio production, Bob directs the very proceedings that many Americans are watching now on the Senate floor.

Bob plans to spend his retirement with his wife Rocio and their daughter Veronica, who turns 3 years old this week. As a native of Minnesota, Bob is a diehard Minnesota Vikings fan. This year, one of his lifelong dreams came true when the University of Minnesota at Duluth won the national championship for men's hockey.

I am proud of the many dedicated employees like Bob that help this Chamber function. The entire Senate family extends our best wishes to Bob Cvar in his future endeavors.

REMEMBERING SALLY BROWN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I rise today to pay tribute and bid a fond farewell to a remarkable philanthropist, a proud Louisvillian, a great-grandmother of 29, and a dear friend. Sadly, Sara Shallenberger Brown—known by her friends as “Sally”—passed away this April 30 in Louisville, just after celebrating her 100th birthday on April 14.

Sally was more than just a leading citizen of Louisville and of Kentucky—she was a driving force of nature. Through her energy, spirit, and great generosity, she made our city and our Commonwealth better places to live.

Sally led a life that would not seem out of place in an epic movie or novel. Born in Valdez, AK, in 1911, her father was a brigadier general who fought in France during World War I and served

with generals Pershing and Patton. In 1931, Sally visited a friend from college in Louisville, and here she met her future husband, W.L. Lyons Brown. When Lyons soon after wrote Sally's parents to tell them he was naming a race horse “Sally Shall,” they knew it had been love at first sight.

The couple made their home in Louisville, where he was the president and chairman of Brown-Forman Corp., a Louisville-based company for over 140 years and one of the largest American-owned spirits and wine companies. Sally became a generous benefactor to Louisville institutions such as the Speed Museum, Locust Grove, the Actors Theatre of Louisville and Waterfront Park.

She was instrumental in preserving Locust Grove, the final home of Louisville founder George Rogers Clark. Where the home had once been abandoned and in ill repair, today it is a museum and National Historic Landmark.

Sally cared deeply and throughout her long life for conservation and preservation. She founded a conservation program to preserve the natural beauty of the Kentucky River. She advocated for the preservation of federal national wildlife refuges, and was present at the bill signing by President Jimmy Carter that saw the culmination of her efforts. She was a delegate to U.N. conferences, and traveled internationally to promote wildlife conservation.

But most of all, Sally will be remembered for her enjoyment of life. She loved to be outdoors, working on her farm. Even in her later years you could often see her riding around on top of her tractor. She was an artist, designer, and breeder of cattle, thoroughbreds and Cavalier King Charles spaniels.

Sally inspired her family, friends and all who knew her as she forged ahead with her many philanthropic and intellectual interests, all while setting the example as the matriarch of the Brown family since her husband's passing in 1973. Together they had four children, 12 grandchildren, and 29 great-grandchildren, and I want to express my condolences to them and other family members at this great woman's passing.

Mr. President, the Louisville Courier-Journal recently published an editorial celebrating the life of Sally Brown. I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was printed as follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, May 2, 2011]

SALLY BROWN: A FORCE OF NATURE

Five years ago, when Kentucky Educational Television produced a documentary about her life, Sara Shallenberger Brown was called “a force of nature.”

For most of the century through which she lived, she was precisely that. And with her death on Saturday, the environmental movement and the community have lost a remarkable leader.

The daughter of an Army general who fought alongside George Patton in World

War II, Mrs. Brown witnessed important events in history at close range. Born in Valdez, Alaska, in 1911, decades later she would become a leader in the drive to save the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska and stood beside President Jimmy Carter when he signed the act protecting it in 1980.

Widowed for almost 40 years from distillery executive W.L. Lyons Brown, Sr., she rejected a comfortable, quiet life and became an advocate for all sorts of causes related to the environment. She traveled to Frankfort to testify about the perils of strip mining and always came armed with a battery of facts, which she eloquently expressed in precise terms.

She often said that to succeed as an advocate on political issues a woman needs to “act like a lady, look like a girl, think like a man, and work like a dog.”

Besides her crusades, Sally Brown enjoyed life. She loved to ride, shoot and take care of her farm. She was as much at home on her tractor as she was in the corridors of power. She took pleasure in the accomplishments of her children and grandchildren and always challenged those she knew to push harder.

She lived well on a grand stage, and with her departure, our city has lost one of its visionary leaders.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID AND IRENE MORRIS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the extraordinary accomplishments of two of the most dedicated and hard-working citizens of the Commonwealth, David and Irene Morris of Hager Hill, KY. Working as a team of husband and wife, David and Irene have worked tirelessly over the years to strengthen and improve the manufacturing industry in Johnson County and throughout the State through their work at the Atlantic India Rubber Company.

Although Irene and David's native roots are in Michigan, the couple moved to Kentucky when the Atlantic India Rubber Company, a 92-year-old company, moved its operations here from Illinois and Ohio in 2003. David and Irene were hired to oversee the day-to-day operations of the facility. Their son and one other employee joined them on their move, and the rest of their employees were hired locally.

David and Irene's decision to take on their responsibilities as manager and executive came at a time when the State's manufacturing job rate was on a steady decline. In recent years, Kentucky has lost too many of its manufacturing jobs, with some especially hard-hit counties losing as many as one-third of their manufacturing employers. But thanks to David and Irene, this was not to be in Johnson County. The couple lived in their warehouse while trying to establish the business, and had to have machines shipped from other locations since the local business community was geared more towards the coal industry than manufacturing, but they succeeded. As only one of nine manufacturing employers in the county, they have raised the local area's manufacturing employment rate, and have helped keep jobs from drifting overseas.